

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION**

BENEFICIENT and BRAD
HEPPNER,

Plaintiffs,

V.

ALEXANDER GLADSTONE,

Defendant.

Case No. 6:23-cv-376-JDK

ORDER EXTENDING TIME TO ANSWER

Before the Court is Defendant Alexander Gladstone’s unopposed application for a thirteen-day extension of time to answer the complaint. Docket No. 30.


Under Local Rule CV-12, a party may request to extend the answer deadline by application to the clerk rather than a motion when the request is not opposed and does not extend the answer deadline by more than forty-five days. Here, Defendant has already requested and received a forty-five-day extension of the answer deadline. *See* Docket No 8. Accordingly, Local Rule CV-12 no longer applies, and the Court will construe Defendant's filing as an unopposed motion for an extension of the answer deadline.

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(a)(4), a responsive pleading must be served within fourteen days after the Court denies a motion to dismiss. The Court denied Defendant's motion to dismiss on May 22, 2024, making Defendant's

answer due June 5, 2024. Defendant requests an additional thirteen days to answer—to June 18, 2024. Docket No. 30.

The Court **GRANTS** the motion. Defendant's deadline to answer Plaintiff's complaint in this case is extended to June 18, 2024.

So ordered and signed on this
May 29, 2024


JEREMY D. KERNODLE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE